

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.nspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/073,308	02/13/2002	Hiroyuki Hattori	02860.0703	4480
75	90 06/18/2003			
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. 1300 I Street, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			COLLINS, DARRYL J	
Washington, DO	20005-3315		ART UNIT PAPER NUM	
			2873	
			DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				سع			
,		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/073,308	HATTORI ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Darryl J. Collins	2873				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH	H(S) FROM				
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. resions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing apparent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro	timely filed  ays will be considered timely.  om the mailing date of this communication.  NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) 🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05</u>	May 2003 .					
2a)□	·	his action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allow	rance except for formal matters,	prosecution as to the merits is				
·	closed in accordance with the practice under ion of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application	n.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-17 is/are withdraw	n from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,2,4 and 5</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) <u>3 and 6</u> is/are objected to.						
-	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
	ion Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the Examin		to by the Examiner				
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 February 2002</u> is/an Applicant may not request that any objection to t						
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on						
וויי	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re		•				
12)□	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
•	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).				
	⊠ All b) Some * c) None of:						
,	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
*	Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International B See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ority documents have been rece Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	vived in this National Stage				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes						
	a)  The translation of the foreign language p Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	rovisional application has been	received.				
Attachme							
1) 🔀 Noti 2) 🗌 Noti	ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Inform	nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/073,308

Art Unit: 2873

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 1-6) in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged.

Claims 7-17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 4.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ijima et al.

Ijima et al teach a molded lens (Figure 2, element 2) for use in an optical pickup, having a first and second optical surface, a first optical surface having a circularly shaped outer periphery, and a flat surface section (Figure 2, element 4) substantially in parallel with a plane including an

Art Unit: 2873

optical axis of the lens as claimed in independent claim 1 of the instant invention. Ijima et al also teach a second substantially flat surface section (Figure 2, element 28), located opposite the first flat surface (Figure 2, element 4) being substantial in parallel with a plane including the optical axis of the lens, connecting the first and second surfaces, as claimed in dependent claim 2.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ijima et al as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Togashi. Ijima et al fail to teach a lens having a correction for astigmatism, however, Togashi teaches an optical pickup lens (column 1, lines 13-17) having a first and second optical surface wherein the lens is manufactured such that correction for an optical error (e.g. astigmatism) is corrected at the time of molding (column 4, lines 47-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the optical pickup lens Ijima et al with the optical lens of Togashi incorporating the well known astigmatism corrective feature for the purpose of obtaining an optical pickup lens designed for mounting in an optical pickup such that undesired oscillations are eliminated.

Application/Control Number: 10/073,308 Page 4

Art Unit: 2873

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3 and6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the independent claims, in such a manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in dependent claims 3 and 6. For example, the claimed limitation of the molded lens having a second circular optical surface with a diameter larger than the first circular optical surface as claimed in dependent claim 3 in combination with the limitation of a molded optical lens having a flat surface section substantially in parallel with a plane including an optical axis of the coupling lens as claimed in independent claim 1, is not taught by the prior art. The prior art again fails to teach the limitations as claimed in dependent claim 3, as outlined above, in combination with the claimed limitations of the molded coupling lens being shaped (e.g., designed) to shape the light beam from a light source as claimed in dependent claim 6.

Page 5

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Darryl J. Collins whose telephone number is 703-308-6476. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 - 5:00 Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Georgia Y. Epps can be reached on 703-308-4883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7724 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

djc

June 11, 2003

Georgia Epps

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800